

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,005	02/08/2002	Hyo-Sang Jung	262/011	6445
7:	590 09/15/2004	EXAMINER		
The Law Offices of Eugene M Lee, PLLC 1101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 2000			PADGETT, MARIANNE L	
Arlington, VA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1762	

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Advisory Action	10/068,005	JUNG, HYO-SANG		
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Marianne L. Padgett	1762		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
THE REPLY FILED 16 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice ) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a chiplaces the application in		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing d b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advi event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	the final rejection. EFINAL REJECTION. See MPEP		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three molearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:			
(a) $\square$ they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);		
(b) $\square$ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);			
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the		
(d)  they present additional claims without canceli	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.		
NOTE: There are NO AMENDMENTS to be enter	ered.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ required place the application in condition for allows 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ance because: See Continuation	Sheet.		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: 8-10.				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<u></u> •		
10. Other:				
Marian	MARIA PRIMA	INNE PADGETT ARY EXAMINER		

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 10/068,005

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's assertion that Bunker's background disclosure is equivalent to fig.2's admitted prior art is not agreed with, since the col.2, lines 43-50 disclosure refer to using inert gas during either raising to atmosphere or pumping down to vacuum. One can not use inert gas while pumping down to vacuum unless one has started inputting that gas before the chamber is evacuated. Applicant's fig.2 does not make any reference to use of Ar during step 320, only during step 300, but Bunker's disclosure implies both. However if further evidence of known safety procedures is desired, see Kuwabara et al (6,156,657) cited as cumulative, where it is taught "Conventionally, when...flammable substance is sucked into the pump...must be purged slowly... before maintenance using an inactive gas... treated under an inactive gas atmosphere..."(about 16th paragraph), which appears to imply that input of inert gas & use of inert gas though out cleaning procedures involving potential flammables is standard operating procedure, thus even at atmospheric pressure one might expect the contaminated area being cleaned to be under inert gas, hence it is there before evacuation. One of ordinary skill who is diligent about safety procedures, and given Bunker's above discussed disclosure would have been expected to apply such conventional knowledge where potential flammability exists, especially given the already implies use of inert gas during pump down.